

Docket No.: 60,130-899  
OOMRA0028

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Appellant: Maass, et al. Group Art Unit: 3634  
Serial No.: 09/672,393 Examiner: Redman, Jerry  
Filed: September 28, 2000  
Title: MOTOR VEHICLE DOOR

Official

**REPLY BRIEF**

BOX AF  
Assistant Commissioner of Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

FAX RECEIVED

FEB 19 2003

GROUP 3600

Dear Sir:

This is in reply to the Examiner's Answer mailed December 18, 2002. The Examiner's Answer raises two arguments which require some brief response.

**ARGUMENTS RELATING TO THE OPENING IN THE VEHICLE DOOR**

First, beginning on page 3, the Examiner argues that Szerdahelyi discloses an access opening formed in the interior sheet of the vehicle door that is sized large enough to allow entry of a module.

**Answer:**

Appellant's claims require a door including a hollow interior space formed between an exterior sheeting and an interior sheet metal. Appellant's claims also require that the door includes an access opening formed between the exterior sheeting and the interior sheet metal sized large enough to allow entry of a carrier module into the hollow interior to close an opening in the interior sheet metal. Although Szerdahelyi discloses a module support 3 that closes an opening 10 in the inner door panel 1b, Szerdahelyi does not disclose any access opening that allows entry of the module support 3 in an interior space formed between the outer door panel 1a and the inner door panel 1b. The module support 3 cannot enter the interior space formed between the outer door panel 1a and the inner door panel 1b through the opening 10. If the module support 3 could enter the interior space formed by the outer door panel 1a and the inner door panel 1b through the opening 10, the module support 3 would be too small to close the opening 10. Appellant's claims are not anticipated by Szerdahelyi.

NOTED  
4/9/03

Docket No.: 60,130-899  
00MRA0028**ARGUMENTS RELATING TO THE COMBINATION OF  
SZERDAHELYI AND CARLO**

Finally, on page 4, the Examiner also argues it would be obvious to combine the guide rails suggested by Carlo with Szerdahelyi.

Answer:

The Examiner states that Appellant's claims do not include the limitation that the window mechanism "face away from the outer door panel and be located on the dry side." Appellant is not claiming to have this limitation in Appellant's claims. Appellant is arguing that it would not be possible to employ the window mechanism disclosed in Carlo in the vehicle door of Szerdahelyi. As the window mechanism of Carlo could not be employed in Szerdahelyi, it would not be possible to combine these references and Appellant's claims 13-22 and 24 are not obvious.

**CLOSING**

For the reasons set forth above, and for the reasons set forth in the main brief, the rejection must be reversed.

Respectfully Submitted,

**CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS**

Karin H. Butchko  
Registration No. 45,864  
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 988-8360

Dated: February 17, 2003

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE**

I hereby certify that this Reply Brief and associated documents are being facsimile transmitted in triplicate to Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C., Art Unit 3613, After Final, (703) 872-9327 on February 17, 2003.

  
Tracey Belanger

N:\Clients\MERITOR\p00899\PATENT\899replybrief.doc